

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 63-66, 68-78 and 94-95 are pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 65-66, 68, 74, 77, and 95 have been amended, claims 64, 94, and 96-98 have been canceled and new claims 99-101 have been added.

Claim 99 defines the process as providing a receiving module removably mounted to a processing module, as supported by paragraphs [0056]-[0065] of the specification as filed and further supported, by Fig. 1 or Fig. 4 of the drawings. Claim 99 further defines the process as collecting organic waste by placing the organic waste in the receiving module when it is removed from the processing module, as supported by paragraphs [0025], [0038], and [0049] of the specification as filed and further supported, by Fig. 1, Fig. 4, or Fig. 5, of the drawings.

Claim 99 further defines the process as reducing the organic waste to pieces before it is dried by operating a reducing element located in the receiving module while the receiving module is mounted to the processing module, as supported by paragraphs [0052], [0054], and [0057]-[0058] of the specification as filed and further supported, by Fig. 1, Fig. 4, or Fig. 8 of the drawings. Claim 99 further defines the process as transferring the pieces from the receiving module to the processing module while the receiving module is mounted to the processing module, as supported by paragraphs [0055], [0060] of the specification as filed. Claim 99 further defines the process as mixing the pieces with a biodegradable binder to form a mixture, as supported by paragraphs [0061]-[0062] of the specification as filed and further supported, by Fig. 1 or Fig. 4 of the drawings. Claim 99 further defines the process as forming a unitary biodegradable solid from the mixture by drying the mixture, as supported by paragraph [0064] of the specification as filed and further supported, by Fig. 1 or Fig. 4 of the drawings.

Claim 66 has further been amended to define that forming the unitary biodegradable solid comprises forming the mixture into a predetermined shape, as supported by paragraphs [0062] and [0072] of the specification as filed. New claim 100 defines the transferring of the pieces from the receiving module to the processing module, as supported by paragraph [0060] of the specification as filed and further supported, by Fig. 8 of the drawings. New claim 101 further defines the transferring of the pieces from the receiving module to the processing module, as

Serial No. 10/661,567
Filed: September 15, 2003
Page 6 of 7

Examiner: Brittany M. Martinez
Group Art Unit: 1793

supported by paragraph [0061] of the specification as filed and further supported, by Fig. 8 of the drawings.

Applicant believes the amendments made herein add no new matter. Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based on prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to be attached thereto. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

The Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview with the Applicant's representatives on January 30, 2009. During the interview, the Applicant's representatives and the Examiner discussed the proposed claim amendments and the cited prior art. Applicant expresses his appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of reviewing the proposed claim amendments, which included new claims 99-101 submitted herein, sent to the Examiner before the interview. While it was agreed that the discussed claims appear to define over the prior art of record, no agreement was reached regarding the allowance of the proposed amended claims as the Examiner indicated more time was needed for consideration and possibly additional searching. Because the claim amendments, submitted herein, define over the applied prior art it is believed that further discussion of the §103 rejections made in the Office Action is moot.

Serial No. 10/661,567
Filed: September 15, 2003
Page 7 of 7

Examiner: Brittany M. Martinez
Group Art Unit: 1793

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all of the claims remaining in the application are allowable over the prior art of record. Prompt notification of allowability is respectfully requested. If there are any outstanding issues that the Examiner feels may be resolved by way of telephone conference, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned to resolve these issues.

Respectfully submitted,

ALEXANDER MANU

Date: February 5, 2009

By: /Mark A. Davis/
Mark A. Davis, Reg. No. 37,118
McGARRY BAIR PC
32 Market Ave. SW, Suite 500
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
(616) 742-3500